

COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING**Professional Services Division**

1900 Capitol Avenue
Sacramento, California 95814-4213
(916) 445-3223
FAX (916) 323-4508



**BILINGUAL CERTIFICATION REVIEW STAKEHOLDER MEETING
CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING
SACRAMENTO
SEPTEMBER 30, 2005
9:30 am – 12:30 pm**

Total number in attendance: 25 - Total includes Commissioner Maytte Bustillos (observer only) and Workgroup Members Lettie Ramirez and Charles Zartman. Consultants Misty Padilla and Marisol Avena, representing the Assembly Education Committee, were also present. CCTC staff in attendance included Beth Graybill, Director of Professional Services Division, Larry Birch, Administrator, Professional Services Division, Consultants Susan Porter, Teri Clark and Marilyn Fairgood

The greeting and introduction of administrators and Commissioners were given by Beth Graybill. A brief background about CTC work over the past two years in the area of bilingual certification and the purpose of the public meeting was given by Susan Porter.

A handout that includes the policy questions was distributed. Marilyn Fairgood explained that there would be a break out session which will allow time to respond to the four policy questions. Attendees were told to use their responses as talking points to guide their discussion and develop a group response for each policy question. It was explained how small groups would be determined and attendees were given approximately 1 ½ hours to discuss and respond to the 4 policy questions and to develop a group response.

The following small groups were formed:

Credential candidates
IHE representatives
IHE representatives

CCTC staff and Work Group members facilitated the group process and answered questions. The following group responses were given.

Policy Question 1: Should the Commission explore alternatives to the current route to bilingual certification for already credentialed teachers?

Group1 Credential candidates – The group suggested that testing must be redefined to equal coursework.

Group 2 IHE representatives - The group suggested the establishment of a BCLAD Master's program, create a coursework option and stay the course.

Group 3 IHE representatives – It was suggested that professional development be offered through the County Office of Education

Policy Question 2: How shall the Commission maintain a structure for bilingual certification for those candidates who are in the process of earning a credential?

Group 1 Credential candidates - There should be a separate bilingual component, flexibility in program options with a focus on cultural competence

Group 2 IHE representatives – No option. We are concerned about an exams option at the preliminary certification level but a program structure should be maintained.

Group 3 IHE representatives – There should be a program option only based on BCLAD standards with professional development available through a county office of education or by exam.

Policy Question 3: Given the increased number of languages spoken by students in California classrooms, how can the Commission provide bilingual certification for more languages?

Group 1 Credential candidates – Bilingual authorizations should be earned through coursework and language proficiency verified through independent study in the language. Diversity studies should be included in the program.

Group 2 IHE representatives – Faculty expertise at the IHEs must be considered. It is suggested that CTC assist with this requirement.

Group 3 IHE representatives – Bilingual program standards must be developed.

Policy Question 4: How should newer models of bilingual instruction be considered in the development of updated requirements for bilingual education?

Group 1 Credential Candidates – Currently, one bilingual methods course is the only methods requirement. Additionally is needed. Bilingual methodologies should be required for all teachers.

Group 2 IHE Representatives – No additional structure needed. Maintain rigor and all teachers should be prepared in bilingual methods. This way, the philosophy stays intact.

Group 3 IHE Representatives – All bilingual teachers should have a high level of proficiency, in English, the target language and in academic language. There should be no dual tier to earn a bilingual authorization. All teachers, not just bilingual teachers, should be trained in bilingual methods.

Question to Consider: In the area of bilingual certification, what is the most pressing issue and should be addressed first? Please add here any other information or comments you would like to communicate to the Commission regarding bilingual certification.

Group 1 Credential Candidates – All teachers should go through the BMED (Bilingual Master of Education) program. CTC should ensure that all teacher preparation programs meet program standards.

Group 2 IHE Representatives - Bilingual training should be available through multiple settings. On a related topic, we are chagrined that the language requirement was removed from the CLAD requirement.

Group 3 IHE Representatives – Advocate for multiple routes but must develop standards and the standards should be addressed by all seeking the authorization.

Additional comments and concerns expressed:

ELA is substantially watered-down. ELA should be revisited and brought up to standards.

Students (teacher candidates) are not getting required methods. 35% of professors are P/T. Infusion of the CLAD competencies is not happening in 2042 program.

Question: What will happen in area of special education? Keep this in mind as a North Star when considering bilingual education.

Following each group report, Susan Porter thanked attendees and advised them their responses would be considered by the Bilingual Certification Advisory Workgroup. An approximate timeline for the BCAWG to complete its work was given.

The meeting ended at approximately 12:30 pm.

COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING**Professional Services Division**

1900 Capitol Avenue
Sacramento, California 95814-4213
(916) 445-3223
FAX (916) 323-4508



**BILINGUAL CERTIFICATION REVIEW STAKEHOLDER MEETING
GREATER LOS ANGELES
LOS ANGELES COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION
DOWNEY, CA
OCTOBER 26, 2005
3:30 pm – 6:30 pm**

Total number in attendance: 30 - Total includes Assembly Member Jackie Goldberg, Chair, Assembly Education Committee, CCTC Commissioners Catherine Banker and Guillermo Gomez, Workgroup Members Teresa Marquez-Lopez, Lilia Romero, Sara Fields and Gay Yuen and CCTC staff Consultants Susan Porter, and Marilynn Fairgood.

The greeting was given by Commissioners Banker and Gomez. An expression of thanks was extended to Yvonne Garcia, Director, Bilingual Teacher Training Program, LACOE and Shelly Spiegel-Coleman, Senior Project Director of LACOE for hosting the meeting. Following the greeting, the meeting was turned over to Susan Porter. Ms. Porter introduced Assembly Member Goldberg and asked if she would like to speak. Member Goldberg responded by expressing her interest in bilingual education and addressed all four policy questions.

Member Goldberg began by stating her continued interest in bilingual education. She stated that she had attended 4 meetings addressing bilingual education concerns: Chino, Marysville, Sacramento and Fresno. Member Goldberg stated that, during those meetings, administrators and parents all expressed grave concerns about continuation of bilingual education. Member Goldberg addressed each of the 4 policy questions. A summary of Member Goldberg's responses is included below.

Policy Question 1: Should the Commission explore alternatives to the current route to bilingual certification for already credentialed teachers?

Member Goldberg said there should be three alternative routes to certification: testing, IHE approved programs and approved professional development options. She stated that it is urgent that the 1st task should be alignment with 2042 pedagogy and practice and that the Commission should eventually include a bilingual special education endorsement.

Policy Question 2: How shall the Commission maintain a structure for bilingual certification for those candidates who are in the process of earning a credential?

Member Goldberg stated there are 150 school districts with bilingual programs and that the teaching content standards of professional competencies in 2042 and bilingual education should be aligned. She stated that local education agencies (LEAs) give preference to teachers with bilingual certification training because they are effective

teachers. Member Goldberg also believes that it is important to keep institutions of higher education preparation programs.

Policy Question 3: Given the increased number of languages spoken by students in California classrooms, how can the Commission provide bilingual certification for more languages?

Member Goldberg reminded everyone that Fresno, Sacramento and Stanislaus all have language and cultural assessments for languages other than Spanish. Member Goldberg suggested agencies with this expertise pool their items to create a common instrument and consolidate them as to create an alternative assessment option.

Policy Question 4: How should newer models of bilingual instruction be considered in the development of updated requirements for bilingual education?

Member Goldberg said that these models presented her with the idea that there should be standards similar to BCLAD with 2042 serving as a starting point or base.

Question to Consider: In the area of bilingual certification, what is the most pressing issue and should be addressed first? Please add here any other information or comments you would like to communicate to the Commission regarding bilingual certification.

Member Goldberg said that it is important that teachers are both bilingual and biliterate and that CTC develops strong standards. She also believes there should be as many pathways and options as possible in earning the bilingual authorization. Member Goldberg also stated that it is vital to encourage teachers to work with students

Commissioner Banker thanked Member Goldberg for her input, and expressed about dual language instruction.

Susan Porter gave a very brief description of CTC work related to bilingual certification over the past two years and explained the purpose of the public meeting. A questionnaire describing bilingual certification issues and a document with the 4 policy questions were distributed. Marilynn Fairgood explained there would be a break-out session for small group discussion and that the questionnaire was intended to serve as a tool to facilitate the discussion. Each group was asked to respond to the policy questions and assign a group facilitator/recorder to record a group response on the Policy Questions document and to report that response at the end of the break out session. It was explained how small groups would be determined. Attendees were given approximately 1 hour and 20 minutes to complete the questionnaire, discuss the 4 policy questions, and develop a group response.

Prior to breaking into small groups, Work Group Member Gay Yuen expressed her concerns about the lack of representation of Southeast Asian languages on the Work Group, and she asked if the Asian Speakers in the room could form one of the small groups during the breakout session. In this way, the Southeast Asian languages would be better represented in the stakeholder process. Commission staff agreed with this suggestion and planned the breakout groups accordingly.

The following 3 small groups were formed:

IHE Representatives

IHE Representatives, representing speakers of Asian languages.

K-12 Administrators, BTTP Coordinators, a K-12 bilingual teacher and two parents of students enrolled in bilingual programs. (One parent did not speak English and used the oral and written translation services of the bilingual teacher in the group to respond to the policy questions.)

Commissioners Banker and Gomez, CCTC staff and Work Group Members facilitated the small groups. Small group discussions took place for approximately 1 hour and 20 minutes. The whole group report began at approximately 5:40 PM.

Because there was agreement throughout the room about possible options to earn a bilingual authorization, responses and suggestions to the 4 Policy Questions were given in a holistic manner and are included below.

Policy Questions:

Question 1: Should the Commission explore alternatives to the current route to bilingual certification for already credentialed teachers?

Question 2: How shall the Commission maintain a structure for bilingual certification for those candidates who are in the process of earning a credential?

Question 3: Given the increased number of languages spoken by students in California classrooms, how can the Commission provide bilingual certification for more languages?

Question 4: How should newer models of bilingual instruction be considered in the development of updated requirements for bilingual education?

Question to Consider: In the area of bilingual certification, what is the most pressing issue and should be addressed first? Please add here any other information or comments you would like to communicate to the Commission regarding bilingual certification.

Group Response

1. There must be multiple pathways, multiple assessments and as many options as possible to earn a bilingual authorization. Consideration should be given to less commonly taught languages such as Cantonese, Vietnamese and Korean.
2. Maintain the rigor and quality of bilingual programs and develop strong program standards.
3. Encourage county offices, school districts and Bilingual Teacher Training Programs to collaborate and form partnerships to offer language assessments.
4. Encourage CTC to develop more programs that offer alternative paths to certification.

5. Senate Bill 2042 should be used as a starting point or base for bilingual certification but there should be additional specific pedagogy and methodologies of bilingual education included in the program.
6. Administrator competencies in CLAD/BCLAD methodology should be required for those administrators responsible for administration of English learner programs.
7. Bilingual authorizations should be offered through a combination of coursework and fieldwork as well as a combination of coursework, fieldwork and exam.

Question to Consider: In the area of bilingual certification, what is the most pressing issue and should be addressed first? Please add here any other information or comments you would like to communicate to the Commission regarding bilingual certification.

One individual asked us not forget secondary schools. Another individual suggested that middle-school and high school bilingual specializations should be considered. Another reminded us there were representatives from many different agencies and organizations in attendance and offered help in developing partnership collaboration in developing alternative assessments. She also stated that if money is an issue in implementing the proposals they can take care of it.

Susan Porter thanked attendees and explained that their responses would be considered by the Bilingual Certification Advisory Work Group. An approximate timeline for the BCAWG to complete its work was also given.

The meeting ended at approximately 6:30 PM.

COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING**Professional Services Division**

1900 Capitol Avenue
Sacramento, California 95814-4213
(916) 445-3223
FAX (916) 323-4508



**BILINGUAL CERTIFICATION REVIEW STAKEHOLDER MEETING
INLAND EMPIRE/RIVERSIDE COUNTY
UC RIVERSIDE EXTENSION
RIVERSIDE, CA
OCTOBER 27, 2005
5:00 pm – 7:00 pm**

Total number in attendance: 62 - Total includes CCTC Commissioner Catherine Banker, Athena Waite, CCTC Ex-Officio Member, Workgroup Member Teresa Marquez-Lopez and CCTC Staff Consultants Susan Porter and Marilynn Fairgood

Jim Sandoval, Vice Chancellor, UCR Extension, welcomed the group. Athena Waite delivered comments on behalf of the Dean and Vice Dean of the Graduate School of Education, UCR Extension. Commissioner Banker welcomed the group. An expression of thanks was extended to Teresa Marquez-Lopez, Director, Biliteracy Institute, UCR Extension, for hosting the meeting.

Because a number of teacher candidates were due to attend after class and a number of teachers who were en route from work, the meeting began 45 minutes late. A questionnaire describing bilingual certification issues and a document with the 4 policy questions were distributed. Commissioner Banker advised attendees how the break-out session would be structured and responses documented. Attendees had approximately 1 hour to complete the questionnaire, discuss the 4 policy questions, and develop a group response.

The following 5 small groups were formed:

Group 1 - IHE Representatives

Group 2 - Bilingual Elementary Teachers, Parents of students enrolled in bilingual programs, Credential Candidates and Newly Credentialed Teachers

Group 3 – Bilingual Elementary Teachers

Group 4 - Secondary Administrators and PPS personnel

Group 5 - Elementary Administrators

Commissioner Banker, CCTC staff, and Work Group Member Theresa Marquez-Lopez facilitated the small group discussions. Following the small group discussion each group was asked to report their group response. The following responses were provided.

Policy Question 1: Should the Commission explore alternatives to the current route to bilingual certification for already credentialed teachers?

Group 1 IHE Representatives – Please note, Group 1 provided a general, written response to all questions and did not respond to each individual question.

- Keep the basic additional requirements of Culture, Spanish Language, History as prerequisites.
- Enhance the curricular content regarding second language acquisition, issues of deficit thinking, pedagogical knowledge of literacy and biliteracy across the curriculum, use of multiple measures.
- Require a biliteracy specialist certificate within the first 3 years of teaching.
- Require BCLAD teachers to take ongoing work towards an MA or administrative credential that includes updated research, pedagogy, and assessment knowledge related to teaching and learning.

Convene a panel of experts in bilingual education to develop a highly qualified bilingual/biliteracy teacher profile in the following knowledge areas:

1. culture/crosscultural
2. languages (oral/written, L1 and L2)
3. pedagogy
4. assessment
5. content areas
6. current research

Group 2 Bilingual Elementary Teachers, Parents of students enrolled in bilingual programs, Credential Candidates and Newly Credentialed Teachers BCLAD teacher candidates/newly credential bilingual teachers—Course routes are needed for experienced teachers since some teachers don't test well, and the [BCLAD] exam is too broad. One candidate described how she failed the culture test, even though she was born in Mexico. She learned more through coursework than through test-taking. Both course and exam options would be good, in case there are teachers who have the background knowledge (especially language and culture) so they can be in the classroom sooner. Also, teacher candidates felt that the language proficiency portion of the test was not high enough for language needs in bilingual classrooms today. Definitely, experienced teachers should be allowed to take coursework.

Parents—Course routes are good ways to prepare teachers. The more coursework, the more prepared they will be.

Group 3 Bilingual Elementary Teachers - An exam route should be available. In addition to the exam, there should be a coursework option that aligns with other professional preparation coursework (2042). The examination should be reviewed and the public should be allowed to provide input about changes made to the exam. Certification held from other countries should be considered as satisfying the language assessment requirement.

Group 4 Secondary Administrators and PPS personnel - Maintain the exam at its current level and require all bilingual teachers to have a high proficiency level in the target language as well as in English. There should also be a coursework option available through undergraduate courses and multiple certification routes, including study abroad programs.

Group 5 Elementary Administrators - The BCLAD test needs to be more rigorous for those who take the exam. If possible, online testing should be available. Coursework is stronger than an exam option for earning a bilingual authorization. The exam option might be relevant for someone with high language proficiency but is not the best certification pathway for all individuals seeking a bilingual authorization. In addition to the exam, IHE coursework should be required. Content that provides a focus on how to better communicate with parents about their children's educational needs and with other educators about the importance of bilingual programs is needed.

Policy Question 2: How shall the Commission maintain a structure for bilingual certification for those candidates who are in the process of earning a credential?

Group 2 Bilingual Elementary Teachers, Parents of students enrolled in bilingual programs, Credential Candidates and Newly Credentialed Teachers BCLAD teacher candidates/newly credential bilingual teachers —There should be an integrated program for bilingual and for the basic program (like an emphasis program).

Group 3 Bilingual Elementary Teachers - Fieldwork is important and should be required in the teacher preparation program. Maintain a credential structure that includes a bilingual field placement. Other options such as outreach programs to recruit bilingual teachers, flexible and multiple pathways to earn a bilingual authorization should be available.

Whatever credential pathway is decided, make it “do-able” – remove as many barriers as possible and provide as many options and flexibility in earning the authorization while maintaining rigor.

Group 4 Secondary Administrators and PPS personnel - Consider including the idea of bilingualism as beneficial in 2042 professional preparation courses. All teachers should understand the need for the programs. Bilingual teacher preparation program routes should include cultural component requirements: one course should be specific to the target culture and one should be a general cultural studies course. There is also a need to streamline coursework required for bilingual certification.

Group 5 Elementary Administrators - Do not add more coursework to the existing program. Instead, exchange coursework to allow for more specificity with a focus on bilingual pedagogy and methodology. Specialized coursework methodology should be offered in all subject matter areas to bilingual teachers. Bilingual fieldwork is important and necessary.

Policy Question 3: Given the increased number of languages spoken by students in California classrooms, how can the Commission provide bilingual certification for more languages?

Group 2 Bilingual Elementary Teachers, Parents of students enrolled in bilingual programs, Credential Candidates and Newly Credentialed Teachers BCLAD teacher candidates/newly credential bilingual teachers —There should be ways for teachers to be credentialed in less commonly taught languages (LCTLs). On-line classes, for example, could be one way to do this. For languages such as Hmong, universities and college with existing BCLAD Emphasis programs could be encouraged to offer programs for LCTLs. Either way, there needs to be expectations for high language proficiency.

Group 3 Bilingual Elementary Teachers - Bilingual instructors must be proficient and biliterate in both the target language and in English. Take a look at other agencies' language assessment instruments (e.g., Embassies, Defense Language Institute) to determine if the Commission can use some of those instruments to assess language proficiency. There should be many options and pathways available to earn a bilingual language authorization should be offered and available.

Group 4 Secondary Administrators and PPS personnel - Look at the various entities training bilingual individuals for various purposes, identify available resources used by the entities to assess language proficiency and make use of those resources. Be sure to include institutions of higher education (IHE) and county offices of education (COE) in the language assessment process. Also, consider satellite courses that can be taken to satisfy the language proficiency requirement.

Group 5 Elementary Administrators - District waivers for bilingual education should be considered. The BCLAD exam must be more rigorous to address language needs .

Policy Question 4: How should newer models of bilingual instruction be considered in the development of updated requirements for bilingual education?

Group 2 Bilingual Elementary Teachers, Parents of students enrolled in bilingual programs, Credential Candidates and Newly Credentialed Teachers BCLAD teacher candidates/newly credential bilingual teachers —There needs to be more pedagogy on teaching biliteracy. Two of the recently credentialed bilingual teachers returned to take classes at UCR towards the biliteracy certificate because they need more expertise for teaching in two way immersion classes. BCLAD by itself did not provide enough rigor in language proficiency, especially for teachers teaching in higher grades. In-house programs (like those sponsored by county offices and school districts) would be good because they are practical and are tailored to the particular students and programs in the districts in which they are teaching.

Two-way immersion is very hard—it is like teaching two classes at the same time. Preparation is double the work.

Parents—There needs to be continued emphasis upon [target] language and culture, especially culture. They want their children to be immersed in Spanish, so the teacher needs to have high language proficiency. Children often live in two language households, so high language proficiency in Spanish and English is important for their teachers. They would like their children to be able to read, write and speak in both English and in Spanish.

Group 3 Bilingual Elementary Teachers - The level of knowledge required for instruction in a dual immersion setting is different than what is required for serving in a bilingual instructional setting. However, the group agreed that all bilingual teachers should be trained in dual immersion methods of instruction. Dual immersion preparation programs should include specific coursework pedagogy and methodologies that address dual immersion instruction. The group believes all teachers and administrators should be aware of dual immersion programs. Additionally, they suggested that Board Members, superintendents and other administrators should have an awareness and understanding of all bilingual instructional programs and the need for the programs. There should be administrator competencies required for those who administer bilingual programs.

Group 4 Secondary Administrators and PPS personnel - Dual immersion instructional methodologies should be offered separately. This should be a specialized authorization. Standards-based instruction should be included in every professional preparation program as well as current research best practices in serving bilingual students in all bilingual instructional settings. Bilingual teachers should be proficient in academic language as it relates to subject matter being taught.

Group 5 Elementary Administrators - Stronger pedagogy is needed along with multiple certification pathways. A professional development option should be available.

Question to Consider: In the area of bilingual certification, what is the most pressing issue and should be addressed first? Please add here any other information or comments you would like to communicate to the Commission regarding bilingual certification.

BCLAD teacher candidates/newly credential bilingual teachers—Fieldwork is very important to bilingual certification. Field placement in bilingual classes and regular classes is important. There also needs to be more release time and staff development time for fieldwork and professional development for bilingual teachers.

All bilingual teachers should earn state certification.

Make sure CCTC continues to offer a bilingual certification option.

Parents – One parent strongly believes that the 50/50 language model is critical in development of native-language proficiency as well as English language proficiency.

The CLAD competencies should be included in coursework only. There should be no video or separate course offerings to earn the authorization. The coursework should be based on standards, included in a program and must be rigorous.

Following the group reports, Commission Banker thanked attendees and told them that public input was important part of the bilingual certification review process. The meeting ended at approximately 7:00 PM.

COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING**Professional Services Division**

1900 Capitol Avenue
Sacramento, California 95814-4213
(916) 445-3223
FAX (916) 323-4508



**BILINGUAL CERTIFICATION REVIEW STAKEHOLDER MEETING
EAST BAY/ALAMEDA COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION
HAYWARD, CA
NOVEMBER 2, 2005
1:00 pm – 4:00 pm**

Total number in attendance: 27 - Total includes Workgroup Member Lettie Ramirez, Hector Garcia, Director of ELD/Bilingual Education for Alameda County and Dr. Olivia Gallegos, Instructor, CSU East Bay, along with CCTC staff Consultants Susan Porter and Marilyn Fairgood.

The greeting was given by Susan Porter. An expression of thanks was extended to Hector Garcia, Director, ELD/Bilingual Education Alameda COE, for hosting the meeting. Ms. Porter also provided a brief description of CTC work over the past two years related to bilingual certification and explained the purpose of the public meeting.

A questionnaire describing bilingual certification issues and a document with the 4 policy questions were distributed. Marilyn Fairgood explained there would be a break-out session to allow time to respond to the four policy questions, using their responses as talking points to guide their small group discussion and to develop a group response. Ms. Fairgood explained how small groups would be determined and told attendees they would have approximately 1 1/2 hours to complete the questionnaire, discuss the 4 policy questions, and develop a group response.

The following 3 small groups were formed:

IHE Representatives
Bilingual Teachers
Parents of children enrolled in bilingual programs

Because many of the parent's primary language was Spanish, Hector Garcia provided translated versions of the 4 policy questions for a small group discussion. Oral translation was provided by Hector Garcia, Dr. Olivia Gallegos, CSU East Bay, and Dr. Lettie Ramirez, CSU East Bay.

It should be noted that because there was agreement throughout the room about possible options to earn a bilingual authorization, responses and suggestions to the 4 Policy Questions were given in a holistic manner and not given as individual group responses. The responses are included below.

Group Responses

Policy Question 1: Should the Commission explore alternatives to the current route to bilingual certification for already credentialed teachers?

The group suggests that for those seeking a bilingual authorization there is a need for access/equality to have multiple certification options available.

Bilingual teachers must know both methods and be proficient in English as well as the target language and there needs to be a balance of the competencies. There should be multiple routes to certification, not just by exam only.

Test scores could be used as a diagnostic tool to determine the need for coursework to meet language or methods requirements.

There is a need for a set of standards for language, culture and methodology.

Policy Question 2: How shall the Commission maintain a structure for bilingual certification for those candidates who are in the process of earning a credential?

The add-on piece (BCLAD) does not work as well as having a teacher training program that places a focus on bilingual instruction from the beginning.

There should be SB 2042 type standards as part of the professional preparation program. Candidates seeking a BCLAD authorization should have the same number of program options as those available to SB 2042 CLAD candidates.

Create a program structure to include bilingual credential programs with BCLAD methods throughout. The IHE methods courses should be taught in the target language.

Because bilingual teachers need time to develop as professionals the program should go beyond preliminary credential requirements and include induction and bilingual professional development.

Policy Question 3: Given the increased number of languages spoken by students in California classrooms, how can the Commission provide bilingual certification for more languages?

The group believes enough languages are currently offered but feels that additional language assessments are needed so that all English learners can have an appropriately credentialed teacher.

Question 4: How should newer models of bilingual instruction be considered in the development of updated requirements for bilingual education?

Newer models should include the teaching of foreign language at the elementary school level (FLES). There is no certification for this and teachers with the language ability can currently teach in the elementary schools. Certification at this level is needed.

Drive and dedication should be attributes of the type of teacher needed to teach bilingual education.

Question to Consider: In the area of bilingual certification, what is the most pressing issue and should be addressed first? Please add here any other information or comments you would like to communicate to the Commission regarding bilingual certification.

Stakeholders made several comments related to increased salary for teachers holding a bilingual authorization. It was explained to the group the Commission has no authority to influence salary increases, however, the group still wanted the comments to be provided for Work Group consideration. The following comments were made.

Certain levels of expertise, such as earning a bilingual authorization should equate to more money (higher salary).

Completing a rigorous program with extra units, such as the bilingual authorization, should go towards an increase on the salary scale, or bilingual coursework should be offered as graduate coursework so that the units can count towards a salary increase.

Additional comments included the following.

There should be a move toward increasing standards for all bilingual teachers. Ongoing professional development for bilingual educators is needed.

Administrators need to complete staff development that focuses on English learners and bilingual programs offered in school districts throughout the state.

The parent group reported they did not want teachers from Spain (Sojourn Credentialed teachers) to serve in their districts because the teachers are not from the cultures represented in their districts. It was explained to the parent group that this issue should be addressed by their local school district, however, the parents strongly expressed their desire to have staff report this information to the Work Group.

Following the report out, Susan Porter thanked attendees and advised them their responses would be considered by the Bilingual Certification Advisory Work Group (BCAWG). An approximate timeline for the BCAWG to complete its work was also given. The meeting ended at approximately 4:00 pm.

COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING**Professional Services Division**

1900 Capitol Avenue
Sacramento, California 95814-4213
(916) 445-3223
FAX (916) 323-4508



**BILINGUAL CERTIFICATION REVIEW STAKEHOLDER MEETING
SAN DIEGO COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION
SAN DIEGO, CA
DECEMBER 14, 2005
9:00 am – Noon**

Total number in attendance: 22 – The total includes Work Group Member Karen Cadiero-Kaplan and CCTC staff Consultants Susan Porter and Marilynn Fairgood. It should be noted that this meeting was in addition to the regularly scheduled San Diego County Office of Education Stakeholder Meeting that took place later in the afternoon. This meeting only included the participation of Bilingual Coordinators representing school districts throughout San Diego County.

The greeting was given by Susan Porter. Ms. Porter also provided a brief description of CTC work over the past two years related to bilingual certification and explained the purpose of the public meeting.

A questionnaire describing bilingual certification issues and a document with the 4 policy questions were distributed. Marilynn Fairgood explained there would be a break-out session to allow time to respond to the four policy questions, using their responses as talking points to guide their small group discussion and to develop a group response. Ms. Fairgood explained how small groups would be determined and told attendees they would have approximately 1 1/2 hours to complete the questionnaire, discuss the 4 policy questions, and develop a group response.

Small Groups were formed and questions discussed. Because there was agreement throughout the room about possible options to earn a bilingual authorization, responses and suggestions to the 4 Policy Questions were given in a holistic manner and not given as individual group responses. The responses are included below.

Policy Questions:

Question 1: Should the Commission explore alternatives to the current route to bilingual certification for already credentialed teachers?

Question 2: How shall the Commission maintain a structure for bilingual certification for those candidates who are in the process of earning a credential?

Question 3: Given the increased number of languages spoken by students in California classrooms, how can the Commission provide bilingual certification for more languages?

Question 4: How should newer models of bilingual instruction be considered in the development of updated requirements for bilingual education?

Question to Consider: In the area of bilingual certification, what is the most pressing issue and should be addressed first? Please add here any other information or comments you would like to communicate to the Commission regarding bilingual certification.

Bilingual Coordinators Group Response

Chart paper 1 Question 17 – Exam Routes

- Need for access /equity to have options
- Proficiency in Target Language
- Need to know both Methods and have Language Proficiency in the Target Language
- Need balance of both Methods and Language Proficiency - so multiple routes are needed not an exam only.
- Score range - a score could determine the need for coursework in order to meet language proficiency or methodology courses.
- Need a set of standards for language, culture and methodology
- Components of SEII include Primary Language Instruction – this should drive the type of teacher certification needed.
- BCLAD should have the same amount of options as CLAD (2042)

Chart paper 2

- Include coursework in the target language as part of preparation
- Should have 2042 for bilingual certification
- Go beyond to the induction and professional development – providing bilingual candidates time to develop as professional
- Added on piece (BCLAD) does not work as well as having the focus of bilingual from the beginning
- Create structure to include bilingual credential program with BCLAD methods throughout primary language instruction of course work.

Chart paper 3

- Certain levels of expertise = bilingual = more \$\$

- Going through rigorous program could provide extra units to go towards pay scale.
- Or offer through graduate coursework
- Looking to raise standards for all teachers in authorization and ongoing professional development for English Learners
- Administrators need development as well for English Learner and bilingual program supervision

Following the whole group report, Susan Porter thanked attendees for their time and advised them their responses would be considered by the Bilingual Certification Advisory Work Group. An approximate timeline for the BCAWG to complete its work was also given.

The meeting ended at approximately Noon.

COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING**Professional Services Division**

1900 Capitol Avenue
Sacramento, California 95814-4213
(916) 445-3223
FAX (916) 323-4508



**BILINGUAL CERTIFICATION REVIEW STAKEHOLDER MEETING
SAN DIEGO COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION
SAN DIEGO, CA
DECEMBER 14, 2005
3:00 am – 6:00**

Total number in attendance: 19 – The total includes Work Group Member Teresa Marques-Lopez and CCTC staff Consultants Susan Porter and Marilyn Fairgood.

The greeting was given by Susan Porter. Ms. Porter also provided a brief description of CTC work over the past two years related to bilingual certification and explained the purpose of the public meeting.

A questionnaire describing bilingual certification issues and a document with the 4 policy questions were distributed. Marilyn Fairgood explained there would be a break-out session to allow time to respond to the four policy questions, using their responses as talking points to guide their small group discussion and to develop a group response. Ms. Fairgood explained how small groups would be determined and told attendees they would have approximately 1 1/2 hours to complete the questionnaire, discuss the 4 policy questions, and develop a group response.

Small Groups were formed and the policy questions discussed. Following the small group discussion the groups reported their group responses. Responses were collected via questionnaire and questionnaire findings are located near the end of all stakeholder notes.

Following the whole group report, Susan Porter thanked attendees for their time and advised them their responses would be considered by the Bilingual Certification Advisory Work Group. An approximate timeline for the BCAWG to complete its work was also given.

The meeting ended at approximately 6:00 pm.

COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING**Professional Services Division**

1900 Capitol Avenue
Sacramento, California 95814-4213
(916) 445-3223
FAX (916) 323-4508



**BILINGUAL CERTIFICATION REVIEW STAKEHOLDER MEETING
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT CENTER**

**CSU SAN MARCOS
SAN MARCOS, CA
DECEMBER 14, 2005
10:30am – 1:30 pm**

Total number in attendance: 22 – The total includes Work Group Member Margaret Olebe and CCTC staff Consultants Susan Porter and Marilyn Fairgood.

The greeting was given by Susan Porter. Ms. Porter also provided a brief description of CTC work over the past two years related to bilingual certification and explained the purpose of the public meeting.

A questionnaire describing bilingual certification issues and a document with the 4 policy questions were distributed. Marilyn Fairgood explained there would be a break-out session to allow time to respond to the four policy questions, using their responses as talking points to guide their small group discussion and to develop a group response. Ms. Fairgood explained how small groups would be determined and told attendees they would have approximately 1 1/2 hours to complete the questionnaire, discuss the 4 policy questions, and develop a group response.

Small Groups were formed and the policy questions discussed. The groups were facilitated by CCTC staff and Work Group Member Margaret Olebe. Following the small group discussion the groups reported their group responses. Responses were collected via questionnaire and questionnaire findings are located near the end of all stakeholder notes.

Following the whole group report, Susan Porter thanked attendees for their time and advised them their responses would be considered by the Bilingual Certification Advisory Work Group. An approximate timeline for the BCAWG to complete its work was also given.

The meeting ended at approximately 1:30 pm.

COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING**Professional Services Division**

1900 Capitol Avenue
Sacramento, California 95814-4213
(916) 445-3223
FAX (916) 323-4508



**BILINGUAL CERTIFICATION REVIEW STAKEHOLDER MEETING
CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING
FRESNO/CENTRAL VALLEY
CSU FRESNO
JANUARY 12, 2006
4:30 pm – 6:30 pm**

Total number in attendance: 16 - Total includes Commission Consultants Susan Porter and Marilyn Fairgood

The greeting and introduction was given by Susan Porter. A brief background about CTC work over the past two years in the area of bilingual certification and the purpose of the public meeting was given by Ms. Porter.

A questionnaire describing bilingual certification issues and a document with the 4 policy questions were distributed. Marilyn Fairgood explained that there would be a break out session which will allow time to respond to the four policy questions. Attendees were told to use their responses as talking points to guide their discussion and develop a group response for each policy question. It was explained how small groups would be determined and attendees were given approximately 1 ½ hours to discuss and respond to the 4 policy questions and to develop a group response.

After the general introduction, two breakout groups worked on the four policy questions.

Group 1 consisted of 4 bilingual education teachers and two program specialists. Two were Hmong BCLAD teachers, although they were currently not in bilingual teaching settings. The other two bilingual educators held Spanish BCLAD authorizations.

Group 2 consisted of a bilingual teacher, teacher educators, K - 12 Administrators

CCTC staff facilitated the group process and answered questions. The following group responses were given.

Policy Question 1: Should the Commission explore alternatives to the current route to bilingual certification for already credentialed teachers?

Group 1 Bilingual education teachers and bilingual program specialists - The group concurred that multiple routes to certification should be available to already credentialed teachers. The group also believed that there should be a mix-and-match approach, so that a teacher with a high degree of language proficiency should be able to be assessed for cultural and/or language proficiency and be able to take coursework in pedagogy.

Group 2 One Bilingual teacher, teacher educators, K - 12 Administrators - The group felt that there should be multiple routes to bilingual certification for already-credentialed teachers. Exam routes should still be offered, but rigorous course options (possibly leading to an M.A.) should also be available for teaching in traditional bilingual and dual immersion programs.

Policy Question 2: How shall the Commission maintain a structure for bilingual certification for those candidates who are in the process of earning a credential?

Group 1 Bilingual education teachers and bilingual program specialists - Two of the participants were recent graduates from teacher education programs. Each felt that while having a BTSA/Induction requirement to their BCLAD would be very helpful, they were concerned that this added requirement might set the bar too high and deter candidates from finishing a bilingual certification along with their other credential requirements. Other group members concurred, and expressed concern that sufficient BCLAD-certified mentors may not be available for the induction component of a bilingual 2042 certificate.

Group 2 One Bilingual teacher, teacher educators, K - 12 Administrators – Multiple certification options should also be available for candidates who are pursuing a preliminary credential. Exams and coursework (which could lead to M.A.) should be rigorous for dual language programs and for traditional & heritage language programs.

Policy Question 3: Given the increased number of languages spoken by students in California classrooms, how can the Commission provide bilingual certification for more languages?

Group 1 Bilingual education teachers and bilingual program specialists – The group reached consensus on the idea of limiting bilingual certification authorizations to the top 4 languages spoken in California, since this would reach 90% of the students who are learning English in this state. Pathways for additional languages might be added later, as resources and needs arose. One member disagreed with this group opinion, offering that less-commonly spoken languages might be accommodated with an internship-type of program, where language proficiency was achieved through a mentoring and on-the-job component to the certification requirements.

Group 2 One Bilingual teacher, teacher educators, K - 12 Administrators – There should be flexibility and multiple options for those who wish to be certified in less-commonly taught languages. Regional assessor agencies, county offices of education, and colleges/universities could be resources for satisfying the language competency requirements. All teachers should have a strong linguistics background in contrastive analysis across languages.

Policy Question 4: How should newer models of bilingual instruction be considered in the development of updated requirements for bilingual education?

Group 1 Bilingual education teachers and bilingual program specialists – The group agreed that a single bilingual authorization should address all models of bilingual instruction and service delivery; dual immersion programs should definitely be considered in the development of new requirements for bilingual certification.

Group 2 One Bilingual teacher, teacher educators, K - 12 Administrators – The group

believes that all bilingual credential candidates should be able to function in all program models. Careful consideration should be given so that additional units do not adversely impact teacher candidates.

Question to Consider: In the area of bilingual certification, what is the most pressing issue and should be addressed first? Please add here any other information or comments you would like to communicate to the Commission regarding bilingual certification.

The Commission should consider an induction program option for bilingual credential holders. This could be developed in conjunction with LEA's and IHE's.

An administrative option is needed in bilingual education for administrators responsible for administration of bilingual programs.

There should be structures to support bilingual educators from abroad in getting credentials in California (for bilingual certification).

Following each group report, Susan Porter thanked attendees and advised them their responses would be considered by the Bilingual Certification Advisory Workgroup. An approximate timeline for the BCAWG to complete its work was given.

The meeting ended at 6:30 pm.

COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING**Professional Services Division**

1900 Capitol Avenue
Sacramento, California 95814-4213
(916) 445-3223
FAX (916) 323-4508



**BILINGUAL CERTIFICATION REVIEW STAKEHOLDER MEETING
CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING
SACRAMENTO AREA/NORTHERN CALIFORNIA
CSU SACRAMENTO
JANUARY 28, 2006
9:30 am – 12:30 pm**

Total number in attendance: 55 - Total includes Workgroup Member Ruth Barajas and Commission Consultants Susan Porter and Marilyn Fairgood

The greeting and introduction was given by Susan Porter. Workgroup Member Ruth Barajas also welcomed the group. A brief background about CTC work over the past two years in the area of bilingual certification and the purpose of the public meeting was given by Ms. Porter.

A questionnaire describing bilingual certification issues and a document with the 4 policy questions were distributed. Marilyn Fairgood explained that there would be a break out session which will allow time to respond to the four policy questions. Attendees were told to use their responses as talking points to guide their discussion and develop a group response for each policy question. It was explained how small groups would be determined and attendees were given approximately 1 ½ hours to discuss and respond to the 4 policy questions and to develop a group response.

After the general introduction, four breakout groups responded to the four policy questions. The following 4 groups were formed.

Group 1 - Teachers – Bilingual and regular education

Group 2 - Teacher Educators, K - 12 Administrators and Parents

Group 3 - Teacher Candidates

Group 4 - Administrative Candidates – It should be noted that this group participated in the activity but provided no written group response.

CCTC staff and Work Group Member Ruth Barajas facilitated the group process and answered questions. It should be noted that one group responded using the questionnaire format. A copy of that form can be found on this website. The following group responses were given.

Policy Question 1: Should the Commission explore alternatives to the current route to bilingual certification for already credentialed teachers?

Group 1 Teachers, Bilingual and regular education - The group agreed there should be multiple options in earning a bilingual authorization. Options may include observation, portfolio, coursework, fieldwork in a bilingual classroom, and staff development through LEAs. The group also agreed the BCLAD exam must be re-evaluated.

Group 2 Teacher Educators, K - 12 Administrators and Parents - The group reached consensus and strongly disagreed with sub-question 1; there was a mixed response to sub-question 2 with strongly agree and strongly disagree. The group reached consensus and strongly disagreed with sub-question 3. Sub-question 4 received a mixed response of strongly agree and agree with sub-question 5 receiving a recommendation of requiring a university or CTC approved exam as well as coursework, methods for Language 1.

On a related topic, the group believes that CLAD should not be offered only via exam. All those seeking the authorization should complete coursework to obtain the authorization.

Group 3 Teacher Candidates - The group recommends completion of a test and coursework (including methodology) to earn the authorization and “up-to-date” coursework equivalency options.

Group 4 Administrative Candidates – No written response provided

Policy Question 2: How shall the Commission maintain a structure for bilingual certification for those candidates who are in the process of earning a credential?

Group 1 Teachers, Bilingual and regular education - The group believes that all teachers should complete the same basic training with an emphasis on language acquisition and best practices. To relieve the statutory unit cap concern, they also feel that some credential requirements should be integrated into degree programs so that bilingual teachers can be compensated at the local level for their training. Align BCLAD with 2042 programs as much as possible and develop/utilize bilingual induction programs. The group believes that bilingual student teaching should be required in a possible delivery format that includes morning seminar with afternoon observation and implementation.

Group 2 Teacher Educators, K - 12 Administrators and Parents – The group reached consensus and strongly disagreed with sub-question 1 but strongly disagreed with sub-question 2.

Group 3 Teacher Candidates - The group suggests that rigorous programs that produce competent bilingual teachers be maintained. Other routes should be considered such as recruitment stipends, partial programs, individually designed coursework options. It is also recommended that advisors for BCLAD candidates are placed at universities. The group also feels that pay that reflects bilingual teacher standards is needed.

Group 4 Administrative Candidates – No written response provided.

Policy Question 3: Given the increased number of languages spoken by students in California classrooms, how can the Commission provide bilingual certification for more languages?

Group 1 Teachers – Bilingual and regular education – The group suggests that the Commission consider utilization of assessor agencies and university programs and investigate contracting outside the country or with other agencies to purchase already developed examinations. They also suggest that agencies with language assessment expertise pool their resources and try to meet as many language needs as possible in a quality manner.

There was one teacher who expressed her concern that we may be trying to solve a problem that cannot be solved and stated that she believes that we should do the best we can using existing language examinations.

Group 2 Teacher Educators, K - 12 Administrators and Parents – There should be flexibility and multiple options for those who wish to be certified in less-commonly taught languages. Regional assessor agencies, county offices of education, and colleges/universities could be resources for satisfying the language competency requirements. All teachers should have a strong linguistics background in contrastive analysis across languages.

Group 3 Teacher Candidates - The group reached consensus and strongly agreed with sub-question 1, agreed with sub-question 2, but disagreed with sub-question 3. No consensus was reached for sub-question 4. The group suggests that there be a Language 1 university or CTC approved examination as well as coursework, methods, etc.

Group 4 Administrative Candidates – No written response provided.

Policy Question 4: How should newer models of bilingual instruction be considered in the development of updated requirements for bilingual education?

Group 1 Teachers – Bilingual and regular education – To There was one suggestion to double assignments per class so that the room would be staffed with two teachers: one who would teach 50% CLAD another who teaches 50% BCLAD.

The entire group agreed that all those seeking a bilingual authorization should be held to the same standard and must be able to implement inclusion models of instruction. It was also agreed that the District should provide further specific in-service training for bilingual teachers.

Group 2 - Teacher Educators, K - 12 Administrators and Parents – The group reached consensus and strongly agreed with sub-question 1. The group strongly disagreed with sub-question 2 and 3 and stated that all BCLAD candidates teachers are already held to high pedagogy standards and methods of instruction for all models of delivery should be offered as program options.

Group 3 Teacher Candidates - The group believes high standards should be expected of anyone who has a bilingual credential.

Group 4 Administrative Candidates – No written response provided.

Question to Consider: In the area of bilingual certification, what is the most pressing issue and should be addressed first? Please add here any other information or comments you would like to communicate to the Commission regarding bilingual certification.

Group 1 Teachers – Bilingual and regular education – The group believes that all teachers should value and encourage retention of native language and utilize these current English learner students as future bilingual teachers (“grow your own” approach.) The group also encouraged the Commission to continue to support bilingual education.

Group 2 Teacher Educators, K - 12 Administrators and Parents - The group suggests the following:

Allow university-based programs to develop bilingual certificate pathways for credentialed teachers.

Study/revise bilingual standards to require BCLAD candidates to know and apply appropriate and current primary language/English language (L1/L2) scientifically-based research.

Place a programmatic focus (money, interpreters, etc.) on rapidly growing language groups (Ukrainian, Russian for example).

Group 3 Teacher Candidates - The group believes high standards should be expected of anyone who has a bilingual credential.

Group 4 Administrative Candidates – This group did not have an opportunity to respond to Question 5.

Following each group report, Susan Porter thanked attendees and advised them their responses would be considered by the Bilingual Certification Advisory Workgroup. An approximate timeline for the BCAWG to complete its work was given.

The meeting ended at 12:30 pm.

The following data was collected via Stakeholder's Forum Questionnaire. The questionnaire was designed by the Bilingual Certification Review Work Group (BCAWG) so that stakeholders could respond to the four policy questions being considered by the Commission. Questions requesting demographic information of each respondent were also included. For your convenience, the four policy questions are included below.

There were 330 responses to the questionnaire. The data was gathered during four Bilingual Certification Review Stakeholder Meetings sponsored by CCTC and were presented to the Bilingual Certification Review Work Group for consideration.

Stakeholder Meetings

San Diego County Office of Education – December 14, 2005

CSU San Marcos Professional Development Center – December 15, 2005

CSU Fresno/Central Valley – January 12, 2006

CSU Sacramento – January 28, 2006

Policy Questions

Question 1: Should the Commission explore alternatives to the current route to bilingual certification for already credentialed teachers?

Question 2: How shall the Commission maintain a structure for bilingual certification for those candidates who are in the process of earning a credential?

Question 3: Given the increased number of languages spoken by students in California classrooms, how can the Commission provide bilingual certification for more languages?

Question 4: How should newer models of bilingual instruction be considered in the development of updated requirements for bilingual education?

Question to Consider: In the area of bilingual certification, what is the most pressing issue and should be addressed first? Please add here any other information or comments you would like to communicate to the Commission regarding bilingual certification.

Stakeholder's Forum Questionnaire: All Responses

Number of Responses 330

<u>Region of Residence</u>		<u>Attended a Public Hearing</u>		<u>Languages other than English</u>	
Region 1	1	Yes	181	Spanish	213
Region 2	0	No	148	Vietnamese	1
Region 3	38	NR	1	Hmong	23
Region 4	21	<u>Location of Hearing</u>		Cantonese	2
Region 5	1	Los Angeles	23	Korean	0
Region 6	7	Sacramento	46	Mandarin	3
Region 7	47	Riverside	52	Tagalog/Filipino/Pilipino	4
Region 8	0	San Diego	51	Armenian	0
Region 9	53	Hayward	0	Khmer/Cambodian	0
Region 10	65	San Jose	0	Punjabi	2
Region 11	96	Other	155	Russian	0
NR	1	NR	3	Arabic	1
<u>Role in Bilingual Education</u>		Other/None	95	NR	1
K-12 Administrator	48				
K-12 Bilingual Teacher	105				
K-12 Non-Bilingual	26				
Parent/Guardian	17				
University Faculty	33				
Researcher/Consultant	8				
Teacher Candidate	24				
Other	68				

NR = No Response

	Number of Responses	Average Range 1-4	Standard Deviation
Section A: Should the Commission explore alternatives to the current route to bilingual certification for already-credentialed teachers?			
1. Credentialed teachers should be able to add bilingual certification by examination only.	280	1.75	0.86
2. Credentialed teachers should be able to add bilingual certification through coursework only.	268	1.96	0.93
3. Credentialed teachers should be able to add bilingual certification through both coursework and by examination.	274	3.02	1.05
4. Credentialed teachers should be provided with multiple options for bilingual certification (e.g., coursework or exam).	272	3.33	0.86
Section B: How shall the Commission maintain a structure for bilingual certification for those candidates who are in the process of earning a credential.			
1. Bilingual credential candidates should be able to continue to complete bilingual teaching authorizations through a CCTC-approved credential preparation program that aligns with SB 2042 teacher preparation programs.	274	3.44	0.65
2. There should be additional ways to earn a bilingual teaching authorization.	273	3.29	0.83

	Number of Responses	Average Range 1-4	Standard Deviation
Section C: Given the increased number of languages spoken by students in California classrooms, how can the Commission provide bilingual certification for more languages?			
1. The CCTC should approve university-based language examinations for less-frequently spoken languages (i.e., Korean, Mandarin, and Filipino/Pilipino).	257	3.35	0.65
2. The CCTC should approve language examinations for less-frequently spoken languages developed by professional organizations such as ACTFL (American Council for Teaching Foreign Languages).	233	3.24	0.69
3. The CCTC should approve alternates pathways to bilingual certification for less-frequently spoken languages.	251	3.27	0.74
4. Credentialed teachers should be provided with multiple options for bilingual certification (e.g., coursework or exam).	148	3.27	0.75
Section D: How could newer models of bilingual instruction be considered in the development of updated requirements for bilingual certification?			
1. The Commission should offer an initial bilingual credential that authorizes teaching in all bilingual education settings.	254	3.11	0.93
2. Bilingual teachers in two-way immersion programs should be held to higher pedagogical standards than those required for traditional bilingual education programs.	247	2.37	1.08
3. Bilingual teachers in two-way immersion programs should be held to higher literacy standards in languages other than English than those required for traditional bilingual education programs.	253	2.55	1.09

	Number of Responses	Average Range 1-4	Standard Deviation
Section A: Should the Commission explore alternatives to the current route to bilingual certification for already-credentialed teachers?			
1. Credentialed teachers should be able to add bilingual certification by examination only.	45	1.69	0.76
2. Credentialed teachers should be able to add bilingual certification through coursework only.	44	1.77	0.80
3. Credentialed teachers should be able to add bilingual certification through both coursework and by examination.	44	3.25	1.01
4. Credentialed teachers should be provided with multiple options for bilingual certification (e.g., coursework or exam).	45	3.53	0.59
Section B: How shall the Commission maintain a structure for bilingual certification for those candidates who are in the process of earning a credential.			
1. Bilingual credential candidates should be able to continue to complete bilingual teaching authorizations through a CCTC-approved credential preparation program that aligns with SB 2042 teacher preparation programs.	46	3.48	0.51
2. There should be additional ways to earn a bilingual teaching authorization.	44	3.39	0.78
Section C: Given the increased number of languages spoken by students in California classrooms, how can the Commission provide bilingual certification for more languages?			
1. The CCTC should approve university-based language examinations for less-frequently spoken languages (i.e., Korean, Mandarin, and Filipino/Pilipilo).	40	3.43	0.55
2. The CCTC should approve language examinations for less-frequently spoken languages developed by professional organizations such as ACTFL (American Council for Teaching Foreign Languages).	41	3.22	0.61
3. The CCTC should approve alternates pathways to bilingual certification for less-frequently spoken languages.	42	3.31	0.64
4. Credentialed teachers should be provided with multiple options for bilingual certification (e.g., coursework or exam).	33	3.39	0.70

	Number of Responses	Average Range 1-4	Standard Deviation
Section D: How could newer models of bilingual instruction be considered in the development of updated requirements for bilingual certification?			
1. The Commission should offer an initial bilingual credential that authorizes teaching in all bilingual education settings.	43	3.23	0.78
2. Bilingual teachers in two-way immersion programs should be held to higher pedagogical standards than those required for traditional bilingual education programs.	40	2.68	1.07
3. Bilingual teachers in two-way immersion programs should be held to higher literacy standards in languages other than English than those required for traditional bilingual education programs.	39	2.49	0.97

	Number of Responses	Average Range 1-4	Standard Deviation
Section A: Should the Commission explore alternatives to the current route to bilingual certification for already-credentialed teachers?			
1. Credentialed teachers should be able to add bilingual certification by examination only.	98	1.69	0.83
2. Credentialed teachers should be able to add bilingual certification through coursework only.	95	1.86	0.83
3. Credentialed teachers should be able to add bilingual certification through both coursework and by examination.	91	2.91	1.04
4. Credentialed teachers should be provided with multiple options for bilingual certification (e.g., coursework or exam).	95	3.11	0.96
Section B: How shall the Commission maintain a structure for bilingual certification for those candidates who are in the process of earning a credential.			
1. Bilingual credential candidates should be able to continue to complete bilingual teaching authorizations through a CCTC-approved credential preparation program that aligns with SB 2042 teacher preparation programs.	90	3.24	0.69
2. There should be additional ways to earn a bilingual teaching authorization.	95	3.25	0.76
Section C: Given the increased number of languages spoken by students in California classrooms, how can the Commission provide bilingual certification for more languages?			
1. The CCTC should approve university-based language examinations for less-frequently spoken languages (i.e., Korean, Mandarin, and Filipino/Pilipilo).	87	3.32	0.67
2. The CCTC should approve language examinations for less-frequently spoken languages developed by professional organizations such as ACTFL (American Council for Teaching Foreign Languages).	81	3.21	0.67
3. The CCTC should approve alternates pathways to bilingual certification for less-frequently spoken languages.	85	3.31	0.69
4. Credentialed teachers should be provided with multiple options for bilingual certification (e.g., coursework or exam).	30	3.23	0.82

	Number of Responses	Average Range 1-4	Standard Deviation
Section D: How could newer models of bilingual instruction be considered in the development of updated requirements for bilingual certification?			
1. The Commission should offer an initial bilingual credential that authorizes teaching in all bilingual education settings.	87	3.01	0.96
2. Bilingual teachers in two-way immersion programs should be held to higher pedagogical standards than those required for traditional bilingual education programs.	94	2.36	1.04
3. Bilingual teachers in two-way immersion programs should be held to higher literacy standards in languages other than English than those required for traditional bilingual education programs.	95	2.56	1.05

	Number of Responses	Average Range 1-4	Standard Deviation
Section A: Should the Commission explore alternatives to the current route to bilingual certification for already-credentialed teachers?			
1. Credentialed teachers should be able to add bilingual certification by examination only.	25	1.80	0.76
2. Credentialed teachers should be able to add bilingual certification through coursework only.	23	2.26	0.86
3. Credentialed teachers should be able to add bilingual certification through both coursework and by examination.	25	2.84	0.90
4. Credentialed teachers should be provided with multiple options for bilingual certification (e.g., coursework or exam).	24	3.33	1.01
Section B: How shall the Commission maintain a structure for bilingual certification for those candidates who are in the process of earning a credential.			
1. Bilingual credential candidates should be able to continue to complete bilingual teaching authorizations through a CCTC-approved credential preparation program that aligns with SB 2042 teacher preparation programs.	23	3.48	0.51
2. There should be additional ways to earn a bilingual teaching authorization.	20	3.25	0.64
Section C: Given the increased number of languages spoken by students in California classrooms, how can the Commission provide bilingual certification for more languages?			
1. The CCTC should approve university-based language examinations for less-frequently spoken languages (i.e., Korean, Mandarin, and Filipino/Pilipilo).	19	3.32	0.48
2. The CCTC should approve language examinations for less-frequently spoken languages developed by professional organizations such as ACTFL (American Council for Teaching Foreign Languages).	13	3.31	0.48
3. The CCTC should approve alternates pathways to bilingual certification for less-frequently spoken languages.	19	3.21	0.63
4. Credentialed teachers should be provided with multiple options for bilingual certification (e.g., coursework or exam).	14	3.00	0.88

Number of Responses	Average Range 1-4	Standard Deviation
---------------------	-------------------	--------------------

Section D: How could newer models of bilingual instruction be considered in the development of updated requirements for bilingual certification?

1. The Commission should offer an initial bilingual credential that authorizes teaching in all bilingual education settings.	20	3.20	0.70
2. Bilingual teachers in two-way immersion programs should be held to higher pedagogical standards than those required for traditional bilingual education programs.	17	2.12	0.93
3. Bilingual teachers in two-way immersion programs should be held to higher literacy standards in languages other than English than those required for traditional bilingual education programs.	19	2.26	0.87

	Number of Responses	Average Range 1-4	Standard Deviation
Section A: Should the Commission explore alternatives to the current route to bilingual certification for already-credentialed teachers?			
1. Credentialed teachers should be able to add bilingual certification by examination only.	12	2.58	1.51
2. Credentialed teachers should be able to add bilingual certification through coursework only.	13	3.15	1.35
3. Credentialed teachers should be able to add bilingual certification through both coursework and by examination.	10	3.20	1.32
4. Credentialed teachers should be provided with multiple options for bilingual certification (e.g., coursework or exam).	11	3.36	1.21
Section B: How shall the Commission maintain a structure for bilingual certification for those candidates who are in the process of earning a credential.			
1. Bilingual credential candidates should be able to continue to complete bilingual teaching authorizations through a CCTC-approved credential preparation program that aligns with SB 2042 teacher preparation programs.	11	3.64	0.92
2. There should be additional ways to earn a bilingual teaching authorization.	12	3.67	0.89
Section C: Given the increased number of languages spoken by students in California classrooms, how can the Commission provide bilingual certification for more languages?			
1. The CCTC should approve university-based language examinations for less-frequently spoken languages (i.e., Korean, Mandarin, and Filipino/Pilipilo).	11	3.82	0.41
2. The CCTC should approve language examinations for less-frequently spoken languages developed by professional organizations such as ACTFL (American Council for Teaching Foreign Languages).	10	3.70	0.68
3. The CCTC should approve alternates pathways to bilingual certification for less-frequently spoken languages.	12	3.75	0.62
4. Credentialed teachers should be provided with multiple options for bilingual certification (e.g., coursework or exam).	8	3.50	1.07

	Number of Responses	Average Range 1-4	Standard Deviation
Section D: How could newer models of bilingual instruction be considered in the development of updated requirements for bilingual certification?			
1. The Commission should offer an initial bilingual credential that authorizes teaching in all bilingual education settings.	10	3.80	0.42
2. Bilingual teachers in two-way immersion programs should be held to higher pedagogical standards than those required for traditional bilingual education programs.	11	3.36	1.21
3. Bilingual teachers in two-way immersion programs should be held to higher literacy standards in languages other than English than those required for traditional bilingual education programs.	13	3.46	1.13

	Number of Responses	Average Range 1-4	Standard Deviation
Section A: Should the Commission explore alternatives to the current route to bilingual certification for already-credentialed teachers?			
1. Credentialed teachers should be able to add bilingual certification by examination only.	26	1.42	0.64
2. Credentialed teachers should be able to add bilingual certification through coursework only.	25	1.84	0.99
3. Credentialed teachers should be able to add bilingual certification through both coursework and by examination.	26	2.85	1.32
4. Credentialed teachers should be provided with multiple options for bilingual certification (e.g., coursework or exam).	28	3.54	0.79
Section B: How shall the Commission maintain a structure for bilingual certification for those candidates who are in the process of earning a credential.			
1. Bilingual credential candidates should be able to continue to complete bilingual teaching authorizations through a CCTC-approved credential preparation program that aligns with SB 2042 teacher preparation programs.	29	3.86	0.35
2. There should be additional ways to earn a bilingual teaching authorization.	28	3.32	1.09
Section C: Given the increased number of languages spoken by students in California classrooms, how can the Commission provide bilingual certification for more languages?			
1. The CCTC should approve university-based language examinations for less-frequently spoken languages (i.e., Korean, Mandarin, and Filipino/Pilipilo).	27	3.33	0.83
2. The CCTC should approve language examinations for less-frequently spoken languages developed by professional organizations such as ACTFL (American Council for Teaching Foreign Languages).	23	3.26	0.86
3. The CCTC should approve alternates pathways to bilingual certification for less-frequently spoken languages.	24	3.33	0.92
4. Credentialed teachers should be provided with multiple options for bilingual certification (e.g., coursework or exam).	15	3.20	0.86

	Number of Responses	Average Range 1-4	Standard Deviation
Section D: How could newer models of bilingual instruction be considered in the development of updated requirements for bilingual certification?			
1. The Commission should offer an initial bilingual credential that authorizes teaching in all bilingual education settings.	26	3.23	1.03
2. Bilingual teachers in two-way immersion programs should be held to higher pedagogical standards than those required for traditional bilingual education programs.	24	2.00	1.22
3. Bilingual teachers in two-way immersion programs should be held to higher literacy standards in languages other than English than those required for traditional bilingual education programs.	25	2.28	1.28

	Number of Responses	Average Range 1-4	Standard Deviation
Section A: Should the Commission explore alternatives to the current route to bilingual certification for already-credentialed teachers?			
1. Credentialed teachers should be able to add bilingual certification by examination only.	8	1.75	0.89
2. Credentialed teachers should be able to add bilingual certification through coursework only.	8	1.75	0.89
3. Credentialed teachers should be able to add bilingual certification through both coursework and by examination.	8	3.13	0.84
4. Credentialed teachers should be provided with multiple options for bilingual certification (e.g., coursework or exam).	8	3.38	0.74
Section B: How shall the Commission maintain a structure for bilingual certification for those candidates who are in the process of earning a credential.			
1. Bilingual credential candidates should be able to continue to complete bilingual teaching authorizations through a CCTC-approved credential preparation program that aligns with SB 2042 teacher preparation programs.	6	3.00	0.89
2. There should be additional ways to earn a bilingual teaching authorization.	8	3.50	0.54
Section C: Given the increased number of languages spoken by students in California classrooms, how can the Commission provide bilingual certification for more languages?			
1. The CCTC should approve university-based language examinations for less-frequently spoken languages (i.e., Korean, Mandarin, and Filipino/Pilipilo).	7	3.00	0.82
2. The CCTC should approve language examinations for less-frequently spoken languages developed by professional organizations such as ACTFL (American Council for Teaching Foreign Languages).	5	2.80	1.30
3. The CCTC should approve alternates pathways bilingual certification for less-frequently spoken languages.	7	3.43	0.54
4. Credentialed teachers should be provided with multiple options for bilingual certification (e.g., coursework or exam).	3	3.33	0.58

	Number of Responses	Average Range 1-4	Standard Deviation
Section D: How could newer models of bilingual instruction be considered in the development of updated requirements for bilingual certification?			
1. The Commission should offer an initial bilingual credential that authorizes teaching in all bilingual education settings.	6	2.83	1.16
2. Bilingual teachers in two-way immersion programs should be held to higher pedagogical standards than those required for traditional bilingual education programs.	6	1.67	0.82
3. Bilingual teachers in two-way immersion programs should be held to higher literacy standards in languages other than English than those required for traditional bilingual education programs.	5	1.40	0.55

	Number of Responses	Average Range 1-4	Standard Deviation
Section A: Should the Commission explore alternatives to the current route to bilingual certification for already-credentialed teachers?			
1. Credentialed teachers should be able to add bilingual certification by examination only.	21	1.52	0.60
2. Credentialed teachers should be able to add bilingual certification through coursework only.	20	1.55	0.69
3. Credentialed teachers should be able to add bilingual certification through both coursework and by examination.	23	3.57	0.73
4. Credentialed teachers should be provided with multiple options for bilingual certification (e.g., coursework or exam).	14	3.14	0.77
Section B: How shall the Commission maintain a structure for bilingual certification for those candidates who are in the process of earning a credential.			
1. Bilingual credential candidates should be able to continue to complete bilingual teaching authorizations through a CCTC-approved credential preparation program that aligns with SB 2042 teacher preparation programs.	21	3.57	0.59
2. There should be additional ways to earn a bilingual teaching authorization.	20	3.00	1.12
Section C: Given the increased number of languages spoken by students in California classrooms, how can the Commission provide bilingual certification for more languages?			
1. The CCTC should approve university-based language examinations for less-frequently spoken languages (i.e., Korean, Mandarin, and Filipino/Pilipilo).	22	3.32	0.72
2. The CCTC should approve language examinations for less-frequently spoken languages developed by professional organizations such as ACTFL (American Council for Teaching Foreign Languages).	18	3.06	0.80
3. The CCTC should approve alternates pathways to bilingual certification for less-frequently spoken languages.	19	2.79	0.98
4. Credentialed teachers should be provided with multiple options for bilingual certification (e.g., coursework or exam).	14	3.29	0.61

	Number of Responses	Average Range 1-4	Standard Deviation
Section D: How could newer models of bilingual instruction be considered in the development of updated requirements for bilingual certification?			
1. The Commission should offer an initial bilingual credential that authorizes teaching in all bilingual education settings.	19	3.05	1.03
2. Bilingual teachers in two-way immersion programs should be held to higher pedagogical standards than those required for traditional bilingual education programs.	16	2.13	1.03
3. Bilingual teachers in two-way immersion programs should be held to higher literacy standards in languages other than English than those required for traditional bilingual education programs.	15	2.40	1.06

	Number of Responses	Average Range 1-4	Standard Deviation
Section A: Should the Commission explore alternatives to the current route to bilingual certification for already-credentialed teachers?			
1. Credentialed teachers should be able to add bilingual certification by examination only.	45	1.98	0.94
2. Credentialed teachers should be able to add bilingual certification through coursework only.	40	2.15	0.89
3. Credentialed teachers should be able to add bilingual certification through both coursework and by examination.	46	2.91	1.01
4. Credentialed teachers should be provided with multiple options for bilingual certification (e.g., coursework or exam).	47	3.49	0.72
Section B: How shall the Commission maintain a structure for bilingual certification for those candidates who are in the process of earning a credential.			
1. Bilingual credential candidates should be able to continue to complete bilingual teaching authorizations through a CCTC-approved credential preparation program that aligns with SB 2042 teacher preparation programs.	48	3.46	0.65
2. There should be additional ways to earn a bilingual teaching authorization.	46	3.24	0.79
Section C: Given the increased number of languages spoken by students in California classrooms, how can the Commission provide bilingual certification for more languages?			
1. The CCTC should approve university-based language examinations for less-frequently spoken languages (i.e., Korean, Mandarin, and Filipino/Pilipilo).	44	3.34	0.57
2. The CCTC should approve language examinations for less-frequently spoken languages developed by professional organizations such as ACTFL (American Council for Teaching Foreign Languages).	42	3.29	0.60
3. The CCTC should approve alternates pathways to bilingual certification for less-frequently spoken languages.	43	3.19	0.73
4. Credentialed teachers should be provided with multiple options for bilingual certification (e.g., coursework or exam).	31	3.26	0.63

	Number of Responses	Average Range 1-4	Standard Deviation
Section D: How could newer models of bilingual instruction be considered in the development of updated requirements for bilingual certification?			
1. The Commission should offer an initial bilingual credential that authorizes teaching in all bilingual education settings.	43	2.95	1.00
2. Bilingual teachers in two-way immersion programs should be held to higher pedagogical standards than those required for traditional bilingual education programs.	39	2.36	1.01
3. Bilingual teachers in two-way immersion programs should be held to higher literacy standards in languages other than English than those required for traditional bilingual education programs.	42	2.76	1.10

Additional Stakeholder Input

The following responses were collected through stakeholder forums that took place subsequent to a Commission-sponsored Stakeholder Meeting. Commission staff did not facilitate these meetings. The forums that took place following the Alameda County Office Stakeholder Meeting and Fresno/Central Valley Stakeholder Meeting are included on the Bilingual webpage in the Stakeholder meeting data. Responses not included in the stakeholder data are included below.

BCLAD Stakeholder Meeting Mills College Project Pathways Seminar Policy Questions 11/7/05

Commission on Teacher Credentialing Consultants:

Susan Porter: sporter@ctc.ca.gov

Marilynn Fairgood: mfairgood@ctc.ca.gov

Policy Questions:

1. Should the commission explore alternatives to the current route (BCLAD Exam) for already credentialed teachers? In addition to test, should coursework be available too?
 - Placement in a bilingual setting with a mentor
 - Choice between testing out or taking the course (or both if don't pass the test)
 - Continuing education
 - Refresher course
 - Test to see if they need a refresher course
 - Course in cultural awareness to learn about new cultures and language groups, new theories
 - For current teachers summer school bilingual placement can be a way to certify them – they should demonstrate an ability to work in a bilingual setting.
2. How shall the commission maintain a structure for bilingual certification for candidates who are in the process of earning a credential?
 - CSET in Spanish could be used for language portion
 - Cultural Immersion opportunity – 3-5 months, years?
 - Teaching/matriculation/school
 - Government funded training to encourage people to take the additional training and units

- Have bilingual education be an emphasis just like Single Subject and Multiple Subject credentials (or in add it as an additional certification with more classes/demonstrated language ability in target language)
3. With more languages spoken by students in California, how can the commission provide certificates for more languages? Spanish still the major group, but we don't have certificates for all the other language groups. Some places have a huge need for a Russian, Japanese, etc... languages, so what are ways we could achieve a certification for more languages?
- Provide certification programs for the top 5 languages. With the other languages they should have coursework that demonstrates their ability in that language.
 - Provide language support to all students through various methods of certification.
 - Review CBEST and its bias. Offer a possible waiver for non-native English Speakers if they are going to be teaching that language (i.e.; Spanish teachers at the secondary level, bilingual teachers if they work with a partner)
 - Give teachers more time to pass the CBEST if they are teaching in a different language but still be allowed to teach under a preliminary credential.
4. How should newer models of instruction be considered in the development of updated requirements for bilingual certification? (Dual language instruction for example, additional certificate programs). How can we do it?
- Online courses
 - Video submission of teaching
 - Resources and strategies/theories
 - Coursework offered through the district
 - Class where colleagues can share information, model lessons
 - Focus on knowing different cultures of kids you teach